UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,332	06/15/2000	Ryan W. Battle	777.396US1	8527

22801 7590 09/11/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
COLLINS, SCOTT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/594,332	BATTLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott M. Collins	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 examined.

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Pre-Amendment A on 06/15/2000 and a notice regarding Power of Attorney on 07/06/2001.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The claims in this application do not commence on a separate sheet or electronic page in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(3). Appropriate correction is required in response to this action.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 12-14 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the method of claim 11" should read "the system of claim 11". Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "cites" in line 1 of claim 25 should be "sites" to correct the spelling. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "from the associated with the image tag with a separate transaction" is incoherent. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the list of servers" in line 1 of claim 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. In claim 19, the terms "small" and "quick" are relative terms which render the claim indefinite. The terms "small" and "quick" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,774,551 (herein referred to as Wu) in view of what would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

13. Referring to claim 1, Wu has taught a method of logging a computer system user out of a server comprising the step of causing a request for data from the server to be issued by the browser, wherein the request causes the server to expire cookies from the browser (Wu column 2, lines 31-38; column 3, lines 1-17; and column 4, lines 3-24 where Wu's "credentials"

correspond to applicant's "cookies" where "cookies" are understood to be personal data stored on a user's computer that authenticates communication to a source.).

14. Wu has not expressly disclosed selecting a logout link or generating a logout page for display on a browser being used by the user. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Wu's unified logout method within a browser. Further, Wu describes his invention as "pluggable" in that it has the ability to be "plugged into" another application (Wu column 3, lines 32-44 and column 4, lines 11-29). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because browsers are well known, simple, and notoriously widely used as a medium to establish communication between a user and secure servers.

15. Referring to claim 2, Wu has not expressly disclosed the method wherein the request further causes the server to send an image to the browser which is indicative of successful logout. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge a successful logout. This could have been accomplished by a simple text message, an image, or any other method of alerting the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because logging out of a secure server is a sensitive process and the user should be given some form of acknowledgment that his/her data has been secured.

16. Referring to claims 3 and 26, Wu has taught the method wherein multiple servers are logged out of by selection of a single logout link (Wu column 4, lines 3-24).

17. Referring to claim 4, Wu has taught the method wherein the logout link may be located on any of the multiple servers and an authentication server (Wu column 4, lines 3-24 where the location of the link does not affect Wu's system and can thus be anywhere.).

18. Referring to claim 5, Wu has taught the method wherein a visited sites cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user (Wu column 2, 19-31 where Wu's "credentials" correspond to applicant's "cookies" where "cookies" are understood to be personal data stored on a user's computer that authenticates communication to a source.).

19. Referring to claim 6, Wu has taught the method wherein selected cookies are expired to log out of the server (Wu column 2, lines 31-38; column 3, lines 1-17; and column 4, lines 3-24 where Wu's "credentials" correspond to applicant's "cookies" where "cookies" are understood to be personal data stored on a user's computer that authenticates communication to a source.).

20. Claims 7-9 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in claims 1-3 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3 above.

21. Claims 10, 11, 15-18, and 24 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in the combination of claims 1 and 2 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of the combination of claims 1 and 2 above.

22. Claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, and 28 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in claim 5 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5 above.

23. Referring to claims 14 and 27, Wu has not expressly disclosed the system wherein the request for a logout page can be initiated via different server pages. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the request

for a logout page to be initiated via more than one server page. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because to only allow the logout page to be initiated via one server page would severely limit the system as a whole.

24. Referring to claim 20, Wu has not expressly disclosed the method wherein the image tag ensures that the image will not be retrieved from cache. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to ensure that any piece of data downloaded was the most current. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to avoid stale data.

25. Referring to claim 21, Wu has not expressly disclosed the method wherein the image tag includes a query. The Examiner takes Official Notice (see MPEP § 2144.03) that "including a query in an image tag" in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. The Applicant is entitled to traverse any/all official notice taken in this action according to MPEP § 2144.03. However, MPEP § 2144.03 further states "See also In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice)." Specifically, In re Boon, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held in Ahlert, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of the assertion. We did not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that was needed". Further note that 37 CFR § 1.671(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official notice". Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more" will be given very little weight.

26. Claims 29-32 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in the combination of claims 18, 20, and 21 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of the combination of claims 18, 20, and 21 above.

27. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung, U.S. Patent Number 5,241,594 (herein referred to as Kung).

28. Referring to claim 1, Kung has taught a system that utilizes one logon in order to access multiple systems that normally require separate logons (Kung abstract; and column 2, line 12 – column 3, line 39). This concept of a unified logon was well known at the time the invention was made, and it would thus have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize one logoff in order to remove access to multiple systems that normally require separate logoffs. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to simplify the user's online experience and security by enabling the user to log out of multiple systems at once.

29. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Planning and Deploying a Single Sign-On Solution" by Netscape Communications Corp. (herein referred to as Netscape).

30. Referring to claim 1, Netscape has taught a system that utilizes one logon in order to access multiple systems that normally require separate logons (Netscape pages 1-6). This concept of a unified logon was well known at the time the invention was made, and it would thus have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize one logoff in order to remove access to multiple systems that normally require separate logoffs. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to do this in order to simplify the user's online experience and security by enabling the user to log out of multiple systems at once.

Conclusion

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a.	U.S. Patent Number 6,243,716	Waldo et al.
b.	U.S. Patent Number 6,237,024	Wollrath et al.
c.	U.S. Patent Number 6,237,009	Waldo et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Collins whose telephone number is 703.305.7865. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am - 5:30 pm with alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703.308.5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

smc
August 28, 2003

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100